

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,022	01/11/2001	Paola Carrai	IT 000001	2188
24737	7590 11/05/2003		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			MCCARTNEY, LINZY T	
	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2671	10
			DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/759,022	CARRAI ET AL.				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Linzy McCartney	2671				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exar	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme						
10. Other:	Man	k gm				
	M	iark zimmerman Isory patent exam	/INER			
	TECH	NOLOGY CENTER 26	:00			

.-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that Suzuki et al. does not show or suggest "scaling the image to adjust first numbers of pixels per line and lines per image that fit in a display on which the image is to be displayed", however Suzuki discloses adjusting the number of pixels per line and lines per image (column 7, line 58 - column 8, line 58) and that the adjusted image fits a display on which the image is to be displayed (column 2, lines 47-50; Figs. 4, 5, and 6). Applicant also argues that Suzuki does not teach processing in dependence on a result of text detecting step. As can be seen in Fig. 1 of Suzuki, steps S5-S18 all occur in dependence of the result of step S4, the text detecting step, i.e. the text detecting step must occur and produce a result before steps S5-S18 can occur. Applicant also argues that adding to the image data is not processing, however adding data to the image is clearly a processing step. Regarding the Ancin patent, the Applicant argues that Ancin fails to disclose changing the text to black and the background to white in a pre-scaling step and returning the colors to their previous colors in a post scaling step. As noted in the previous Office Action, Ancin discloses changing the text to black and the background to white in a low resolution preview document, i.e. prescaling (column 10, lines 39-43; column 11, lines 16-25) and returning the text and background colors to their previous colors in a post-scaling step in a high resolution version of the same document (column 10, lines 48-50; column 11, lines 41-45; column 18, lines 7-41).